

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

**STATUS CONFERENCE**

---

**IN RE PORK ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

This Document Relates To: All Actions

**COURT MINUTES – CIVIL**

BEFORE: Hildy Bowbeer  
U.S. Magistrate Judge

Case No.:	18-cv-1776 (JRT/HB)
Date:	October 15, 2018
Court Reporter:	n/a
Courthouse:	St. Paul
Courtroom:	n/a
Commenced:	9:31 a.m.
Concluded:	10:02 a.m.
Time:	31 minutes

---

**APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiffs: Dan Hedlund, Dan Gustafson, Michelle Looby, Shana Scarlett, Steve Berman, Joe Bruckner, Brian Clark, Bruce Simon, Melissa Weiner, Bobby Pouya, Michael Pearson, Shawn Raiter, and Blaine Finley

For Defendants: Richard Parker, Brian Robison, Josh Lipton, Stephanie Pearl, John Cotter, John Kvinge, Britt Miller, Robert Entwistle, Jaime Stilson, William Greene, Peter Schwinger, Christine Briesachker, Stephen Neuwirth, Sami Rashid, Richard Duncan, Craig Coleman, Isaac Hall, William L. Monts III, Justin W. Bernick, Kim Schmid, Gene Summerlin, Tiffany Rider Rohrbaugh, Lyndsey Strang, and Jonathan Justl

**PROCEEDINGS:**

The Court and counsel discussed the matters identified in the parties' Joint Status Report [Doc. No. 147].

The Court has conferred with the Honorable John R. Tunheim, Chief Judge, and the agreed-upon briefing schedule and word limits described in the parties' Joint Status Report [Doc. No. 147] are acceptable. The Court will issue a separate order adopting those deadlines and word limits. Defendants' counsel will thereupon promptly contact Chief Judge Tunheim's calendar clerk to obtain a hearing date on the motions.

On or before **Friday, October 26, 2018**, the parties will submit a proposed protective order and

a proposed ESI protocol to the Court. Any remaining disputes will be described in a joint letter also due on October 26.

On or before **Friday, October 26, 2018**, each Defendant will respond in writing to Plaintiff's July 19 letter concerning the preservation of ESI.

The Court will hear oral argument on Defendants' anticipated motion to stay discovery pending the resolution of the motions to dismiss on **Wednesday, November 21, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.** The attorneys who will argue the motion may appear in person or by telephone. The Court's judicial assistant will set up a conference bridge for the call and circulate the dial-in and access information to the attorneys of record.

The parties must advise the Court's chambers by email on or before **Friday, November 16, 2018**, of the attorneys who will argue the motion to stay discovery and whether the attorneys will argue in person or by telephone. The parties must also advise the Court of any other attorneys who will attend the hearing in person or by telephone. Meanwhile, the parties must continue to meet and confer over areas in dispute, move forward with matters on which they have agreed to proceed notwithstanding the requested stay, and ensure to clarify in their motion papers precisely what they have agreed on and what remains in dispute. If further agreements are reached prior to the hearing such that the issues in dispute are narrowed, the parties should promptly update the Court. The Court adopted the briefing schedule on the motion to stay discovery proposed by the parties in their Joint Status Report.

The Court will not schedule a Rule 16 pretrial scheduling conference before the anticipated motion to stay discovery is decided.

The Court will convene the next telephonic status conference on **Wednesday, November 21, 2018**, immediately following the hearing on the motion to stay discovery. The parties must submit a joint update letter by **Friday, November 16, 2018**. The same conference bridge used for the hearing will be used for the status conference. The same guidelines for participants will apply.

The Court will issue orders on the motions for lead class counsel forthwith.

s/Adrienne Meyers  
Judicial Law Clerk